



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
702,615 05/17/91		R.E.BAINES	F-8913/859-1

EXAMINER	
R. SKUDY	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2102	10

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MR. J. FINDER (3) _____

(2) _____ (4) _____

Date of interview 08/27/92Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No. If yes, brief description: _____Agreement was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. was not reached.Claims discussed: 7Identification of prior art discussed: MULLERDescription of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant will provide an amendment to place the subject application in condition for allowance.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

Unless the paragraphs below have been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action.Robert Skudy

Examiner's Signature

Serial No. 702,615 Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Recitation "a brush assembly" (claim 6) is not clear, see claim 7; "the motor" (claim 7) no antecedent basis; "brush body" (two occurrences, claim 7) not clear.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that

the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Baines, Strobl or Campbell in view of Muller, or Muller alone.

Baines (Fig. 1), Strobl (Fig. 5, 7-9) or Campbell (Fig. 1) generally teaches the recited subject matter, except for support arms and brushes having different resonance frequency. Muller (Fig. 3) teaches wiper arms which are analogous to brushes and arms. The arm of Muller are of different lengths or sizes and the resonance frequencies of the arms are of different.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the sizes of the brushes of Baines, Strobl or Campbell in view of teaching in Muller so that the difference in length or size of the wiper arms, which is equivalent to brushes and arms, would produce different resonance frequencies because all reference are in the same environment.

As further, note that Muller (col. 2, lines 33-40) teaches wiper arms, which are analogous to the subject support and brush means, of different lengths or sizes so that the resonance frequencies will be different. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art that the recited subject matter does not produce substantial unobvious or unexpected results over Muller.

The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on January 15, 1992 have been approved.

The Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. 1017 O.G. 4. It is applicant's responsibility to

Serial No. 702,615

-4-

Art Unit 212

ensure that the drawings are corrected. Corrections must be made in accordance with the instructions below.

R. Skudy



Skudy/ds
March 17, 1992